<u>**Vision Group B – Governance and Medical Control**</u>
Meeting Minutes for December 1, 2000
EMS Vision Update 2000 Conference: Integrating the Pieces
Breakout Sessions 1&2
Marines' Memorial Club, San Francisco

I.   **Agenda**
-Membership
-Review of Work to Date
-Objective 15 – August 22, 2000 Meeting
-Discussion and Input

II.   **Introduction**
Membership
Ron Blaul, Chuck Baucom, Lou Meyer, David Nevins, Gerald Simon,
Barbara Pletz, Michael Osur, Joe Barger, Bill McCammon, Dick Mayberry,
Kevin White (Alternate), Ray Navarro, Jan Ogar, Sheldon Gilbert (Alternate),
Leonard Inch.

III.   **Summary**
Review of Work to Date
-17 Objectives were assigned to the group.
-The group decided to take the sub-group approach to working out the
 objectives.
-Early work began on 11 of the objectives (1-4, 7, 10-15). The remaining
 objectives (5, 6, 8, 9, 16, 17) were placed on hold.

-***Objective 1***-Completed. EMSA developed a written process and matrix for
 the Governance Committee and the VLT to review. The EMSA
 process/matrix will be put in the State EMS Plan and/or EMS System
 Guidelines.
-***Objective 2***-Focus group to finalize and present to the entire committee.
-***Objective 3***-Developing language of shared responsibilities for an EMSA
 Administrative Director and an EMSA Medical Director for the Focus Group
 to review.
-***Objective 4***-Vision Group D (System Evaluation & Improvement) is working
 on this objective. A first draft has been completed. Vision Group D feels
 that H & SC1797.102 gives EMSA the authority to monitor and evaluate
 local EMS agencies. Governance will define the process to be followed,
 makeup of evaluation team and non-compliance actions.
-***Objective 7***-EMSA is setting up a task force to address.
-***Objective 10***-Kevin White is participating on the EMT-I, EMT-P and the
 Education & Personnel Committees. These three committees are also
 working on this objective. Kevin will bring the draft recommendations from
 these groups to the next Governance meeting.

-*Objective 11*-David Nevins is rewriting the recommendations for this
objective.
-*Objective 12*-EMDAC is currently working on this, will review their
proposed process when completed.
-*Objective 13*-EMDAC is working on this objective.
-*Objective 14*-EMDAC is working on this objective.

Objective 15 – August 22, 2000 Meeting

Objective 15
-Two models (city and county) developed at the 08/22/00 meeting. Members
are taking models to their group for review and comment.

August 22, 2000 Meeting
-Actual Outcome
-Deal Breakers
-Model Review
-Model Discussion
-Next Steps

-*Actual Outcome*
-Agreement on system participation.
-General agreement only that shared governance is the group goal.
-Generate a model.
-After several starts, one model was developed in concept.
-The model *did not* generate consensus.
-The two versions are still some distance apart.
1. "Municipal Model"
2. "County Model"

-*Deal Breakers*
-Counties must not have the ability to "override" or have more power in the
decision making than the other participants. (Municipal perspective)
-50% "vote" of one single stakeholder (county included) is not shared
governance. Must be equal for all participants. (Municipal perspective)
-County must have, at a minimum, a "vote" structure where 40% of the "vote"
rests with the county, 40% with municipal concerns and 20% vested in an as
yet unidentified 3rd neutral party. (County perspective)
-Any body with final mandated authority must be made up of a group of
separately or already elected officials. Appointed officials are bad
government in concept. (County perspective)
-Some places are working and don't feel they need to change, whatever model
is developed, it must be enabling not mandatory. (County perspective)
-Any governing mechanism must not have any "pockets of underserved"
population. (This perspective was first expressed by County representatives
early in the Vision process, now it is generally agreed upon by all system

participants)

-Model Review

Municipal Model   County Model

<u>**Board of Directors**</u>   <u>**Board of Directors**</u>
-Existing Elected Officials   -Existing Elected Officials
-Balances Interests, not numbers   -Balances Interests, not numbers
*Decision by simple majority   *Supermajority at Board for
                                              approval and veto

<u>**Commission**</u>   <u>**Commission**</u>
-Made up of Stakeholders   -Made up of Stakeholders
-Decision Final if 2/3 Majority   *Anything could stop at Commission
-If not 2/3 majority, decision moved   level
 to Board of Directors   *Simple majority for approval

-Model Discussion
- Both versions have a separate Joint Powers or similar sort of governmental
  entity.
     - There would be a Board of Directors.
     - There would be a Commission of stakeholders.
- The Board of Directors (BoD) would be comprised of *existing* elected
   officials from system participants.
     - This BoD would have final mandated authority of some of those defined
       areas of responsibility.
     - The commission's system decisions would be subordinate to the BoD in
       some circumstances.
- The BoD would be a 5 member body, with two county officials, two
  city/district officials and a 5th "neutral" official as yet undetermined, possibly
  a state representative from the areas in question.
- There is disagreement in the manner of decision making.
- There is also disagreement with the items in which the Commission has final
  mandated authority.
- <u>The "Municipal" position</u>:
     - The Municipal model holds that if the commission makes a decision by a
       2/3 majority, then the decision is final and would *not* be heard by the
       BoD.
     - Items not achieving a 2/3 majority are moved to the BoD for decision.
       Those items before the BoD would require a <u>*simple majority*</u> for a
       decision.

- The "County" position:
    - The Commission may veto to refuse to approve any matter related to its defined areas of responsibility, but *all* decisions approved by this Commission must be "ratified" by going to the BoD and receiving an action to approve or veto there.
    - Any action by the BoD would require a *supermajority* of 4/5 vote rather than a simple majority 2/3 vote.

-Next Steps
- The group has agreed this model accurately reflects the positions and discussions.
- The summary is being circulated within the constituent groups for policy level feedback on the positions.
- If there is room for further movement and development in the model(s), then the group will arrange another all day work meeting on this subject.
    - The expected outcome will continue to be a model developed sufficiently for all constituent groups to provide written support of the concept as a possible solution to move to the VLT.
- If it is determined by the constituent groups that there is no room for movement or further development:
    - The issue will be tabled while the Governance group works on the other objectives.
    - The issue may be revisited in the future of the project as changes perspectives or environment dictate/allow.

IV. Questions/Discussion/Input
Session 1
- What will the make up of the "commission" in the models be?
    - The make up should not be specified in statutes.
- What is the reasoning behind simple majority vs. super majority?
    - Super provides a surety of majority with no question.
    - Protects counties interests.
- Are there any other models in other states that are similar?
    - There are some.
- There was a suggestion that 4/5 majority be used only in issues that call for it (in relation to importance), but not all of the time.
- There was a suggestion to run issues through the Authority or some independent evaluation.
- A self-grading system was suggested.
- The group requested for those systems who currently have working models, to submit them to the group so that they can review them and maybe pull a few ideas from them.

Session 2
- Background information on the existing models was requested.
- Why does the state need to impose a way of governing local EMS?

- The *state* doesn't, it was needed. A lot of different groups are looking to develop this.
- It was suggested that the legislature be considered in considering the models.
- It was suggested to document the method of operation so that incoming personalities can see how things work.
- It was also suggested that the group don't automatically dismiss models due to perception. They should work them out anyway.